DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 074 TM 029 405

AUTHOR Bullard, Beverly
TITLE Teacher Self-Evaluation.
PUB DATE 1998-11-06
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (27th, New Orleans, LA, November 6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Action Research; Career Development; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Journal Writing; Literature Reviews; *Peer Evaluation; *Portfolio Assessment; *Professional Development; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Story Telling; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Reflective Practice

ABSTRACT

Several methods by which teachers are able to make a useful assessment of their own instruction and prescribe improvements for their own teaching are described. The literature on these evaluation methods is also reviewed. These methods include: reflective evaluation, an important part of the new approach to teacher self-evaluation; action research projects and teacher journals, techniques used to enhance teacher reflections on teaching; teaching portfolios, valuable for self-evaluation because they give the teacher a structure for documenting and reflecting on practice and can capture the complexities of professional practice in ways no other approach can; the "2 + 2 for Teachers" system (D. Allen, R. Nichols, and A. LeBlanc (1997)), a teacher performance appraisal program that involves teachers and administrators in a series of regular peer observations; Career Development Reinforcing Excellence (CADRE), a career development program that promotes accountability for and reflective inquiry about teaching and learning while challenging long-held assumptions about and practices in supervision, evaluation, and professional development; peer coaching, another aspect of staff development that leads to teacher self- evaluation; storytelling, another way for teachers to think about and to behave toward children different from themselves; and sharing stories that can result in collaborative critique leading to improved teaching. All of these approaches provide opportunities for teachers to engage in self-reflection and collegial interactions. (Contains 56 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 074

TEACHER SELF EVALUATION

by
Beverly Bullard

The University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Mid-South Education Research Association
November 6, 1998
New Orleans, LA

TM029405

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beverly Bullard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The way educators think about teacher evaluation has changed due to the press for accountability by school districts and state school systems. Most authorities would agree that the real purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction. Current trends and reform efforts point toward evaluations for improvement of instruction. This paper explores several evaluation methods by which teachers are able to make a useful assessment of their instruction and prescribe improvements for their own teaching. This paper discusses evaluation methods such as: reflective evaluation, portfolio assessment, 2 + 2 for Teachers, Career Development Reinforcing Excellence (CADRE), peer coaching, storytelling.

TEACHER SELF EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

Teacher evaluation started with supervision. According to Atkins (1996), once upon a time supervisors were primarily engaged in inspection, an approach based on the assumption that an educational supervisor's job was to find all the wrong things that teachers were doing in their classrooms. Teachers were not often well educated and frequently stayed only a step ahead of their students in basic skills. Frederick Taylor's scientific management ideas carry over to school supervision when teachers are viewed as implementors of highly refined curriculum and teaching systems where closed supervision is practiced to ensure that teachers are teaching in the way in which they are supposed to and that they are carefully following approved guidelines and teaching protocols (Atkins, 1996, p. 2).

Stiggins (1986) reviewed the reasons for teacher evaluation. Some instruments or evaluations are used for hiring, firing, promotion, and merit pay for teachers. These instruments are used as measures of accountability and competence. These data are normally required by state law to demonstrate at least minimum competence of teachers and must be verifiably objective and standardized for all teachers and administrators. The other purpose noted by Stiggens for evaluation is teacher growth.

Evaluations for the purpose of teacher's growth usually include assessment by other teachers and students, as well as by administrators. These evaluations give valuable information and feedback to teachers concerning how they are being perceived. Atkins (1996) found that a majority of teachers felt that peer observation and peer professional coaching would be helpful to the professional growth.

Since the mid-1980's, school districts and state school systems have been hit by the press for accountability driven by the teacher effects research and Madeline Hunter's work (Brandt, 1996). Because of this, the way educators think about teacher evaluation programs has changed. Atkins (1996) stated that many people perceive evaluation as quality control in teaching and as a means for weeding out incompetent teachers. Teachers perceive evaluation as a part of the job of the principal. Most authorities would agree that the real purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction. Current trends and reform efforts point toward evaluations for improvement of instruction. Many districts have moved away from the goal-setting models and toward teacher effectiveness, a model which has dominated the teacher evaluation programs since the mid 1980s. Current teacher evaluation programs seem to be moving toward the use of observations and mentoring for beginning teachers, and long-term professional development projects for experienced teachers (Brandt, 1996).

The public has been dissatisfied with schools. Teachers and school administrators have been frustrated that conventional evaluation practices have not really served the purposes of effective evaluation. The dissatisfaction stems from teacher evaluations based on how good teachers behave. A comparison is made to see if teachers behave in the

manner expected of good teachers. The old way refers back to the research on teacher behaviors and the notion of strong administrators who know what to look for. It relies almost exclusively on classroom observations done every year or two and on summative write-ups after that (Brandt, 1996).

In recent years, expectations for what constitutes good subject-matter teaching has changed. Today, teachers are being urged to move from explicit instruction models to more constructivist teaching, with students actively involved and with instruction leading to more complex outcomes. This has resulted in a change in the kinds of teacher evaluation data collected and a change in how these data are processed. Paulsen and Feldman (1995) noted that there is dissatisfaction with much of the instruction now going on in American colleges and universities. Criticisms of teachers and teaching have come from legislators, students, college administrators, and even some faculty members.

The study of how adult professionals grow and develop has also contributed to the change in how teacher evaluations are conducted. According to Brandt (1996), adults respond primarily to positive reinforcement, they want to be involved, and they prefer to operate in a collegial and collaborative environment. The traditional method of teacher evaluation by comparison to set standards violates many of these new understandings about adult professional growth.

The trend today is to utilize models of evaluation for beginning teachers based on observations and mentoring as opposed to long-term professional development projects for experienced teachers. Beginning teachers have special needs as they develop their expertise over time. In order to become successful teachers, beginning teachers must

acquire a basic set of teaching skills. These skills have been determined based on school effectiveness research and Madeline Hunter's work. Brandt (1996) concluded that

> beginning teachers must have much more intensive involvement of administrative support with alternative sources of data such as multiple observations, journal writing, and artifact collections. These approved activities are then accompanied by a strong mentoring program and mandatory staff development focused on basic teaching skills. Altogether, someone needs to provide at least 10 to 14 hours of contact time with these beginning teachers each year over their one, two, or three years of probation. (p. 31)

The biggest changes in teacher evaluation have come in the area of the experienced teachers. Districts have begun to create professional growth tracks for their experienced teachers. This professional growth track is usually built around some version of individual goal setting and based on recognition that it is absolutely essential for people to set their own goals (Brandt, 1996). Individual goals are often referred to as "professional development plans" (i.e., long-term projects that teachers develop and carry out).

Once the goals are established, they become the goals of the teacher and the supervisor. The teacher and supervisor work on the goals together. According to Brandt (1996), at the end of the year or designated time frame, the two (teacher and administrator) sit down with their notes and with the data they have gathered, and together they write up what was accomplished, their reflections, and where they are going next. There are no summative write-ups, no ratings, and no evaluative commentary.

There are other models of professional growth tracks for experienced teachers that involve teachers working in teams. A team can be formed and a professional development plan for the team can be developed. Once administrators agree or approve the professional development plan for the team, the administrator becomes a facilitator, a coach, or a resource provider.

Even though there have been changes in the mindset underlying teacher evaluation in recent years, systems must allow some provision for difficulties. There may be situations that arise that would call for some administrator intervention. The teacher and supervisor may try to work out a problem through classroom visits or coaching. A team of teachers could also be established to work with a teacher in solving the problem. Saphier (1993) addressed the problem of dealing with "incompetents" and "unsatisfactory performers" as:

> healthy cultural conditions, energized growth-oriented workplaces for adults and the practices that support them, cannot flourish at their highest level unless procedures for "at-risk" teachers and "dismissal" actions are clearly developed, are operating successfully and fairly, and are seen by teachers as 1) maintaining worthwhile professional standards and 2) not threatening or even applicable to the vast majority of practitioners. (p. 11)

According to Barth (1990) in support of the school being a community of learners, the principal need no longer be the "headmaster" or "instructional leader" pretending to know all. The principal's role now should be one of "head learner"--experiencing, displaying, modeling, and celebrating what is hoped and expected that teachers and students will do. (p. 46) Therefore, teachers in a learning environment should engage in

continuous inquiry about teaching. They are researchers, students of teaching, who observe others, teach, have others observe them, talk about teaching, and help others teach (Barth, 1990, p. 46).

The new form of teacher evaluation has rendered a professional development plan that provides for teachers to work together more actively than in the past with more collaboration and more collegial conversation. Even the teachers who are still teaching in the traditional methods have shifted toward more active student involvement and more imaginative approaches to assessment.

Methods of Teacher Self Evaluation

Reflective Evaluation

Teacher self (reflective) evaluation has evolved as an important part of the "new" teacher evaluation process by way of professional development. Reflection has been defined as the process of learning from experience (Wear & Harris, 1994; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). The reflective teacher must reconstruct the events, emotions, and accomplishments of a teaching experience. Barell (1991) defines a reflective teacher as one who monitors his or her own teaching decisions when designing learning environments. Ross (1990) describes reflection as a process of teaching and then analyzing lessons in order to increase teacher control over variables that affect learning. According to Ross (1990), one way to accomplish this is through action research conducted in a field setting; the practitioner selects a problem to be studied, then conducts the necessary data collection and analysis. Good and Brophy (1991) define action research as self-reflective

problem solving which allows practitioners to improve their performance by directly studying their work. According to Sagor (1997), teacher action research has focused on helping individual educators or teachers to become better reflective practitioners. Action research involves the practitioner following six sequential steps: (a) formulating a problem, (b) planning for data collection, (c) collecting data, (d) analyzing data, (e) reporting results, and (f) taking action. The theory behind this approach is that when teachers elect to develop the habits of mind and the disciplines of inquiry that result from repeated experience with the action research process, they not only become more effective practitioners, but also more fulfilled educators (Sagor, 1997, p. 172). The ultimate foundation of all reflective practice or self-reflection is the ability and opportunity to engage in self-evaluation or self-assessment (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995).

Reflective thinking is not a new notion. Socrates contrasted perceiving of things outside the self with reflection, the discovery of what is within and brought to birth by questioning (O'Donoghue & Brooker, 1996; Francis, 1995). Teaching is a highly intellectual process requiring continuous decision making before, during, and after classroom instruction (Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Colton & Spark-Langer, 1993; Costa, 1995; Lampert & Clark, 1990; Pultorak, 1996). Teacher reflectivity enhances the skills for this process to occur. The ability to think about what one does and why--assessing past actions, current situations, and intended outcomes--is vital to intelligent practice, that is, practice that is reflective rather than routine (Borko, Michalec, Timmons, & Siddle, 1997; Richert, 1990). Teachers should sometimes stop in the teaching process, think about their work, and make sense of it. These reflections influence how one grows as a professional

by influencing how successful one is at learning from one's experience (Borko, Michalec, Timmons, & Siddle, 1997). Pultorak (1996) found that teacher reflectivity is a developmental process, and through the use of reflective interviews, individuals were able to invoke reflection concerning the caliber of their own teaching for a given lesson and create a more self-evaluative position. Carroll (1981) quoted Ostrander (1996) stating that self-evaluation can provide useful data by offering "information and perspectives that may be unavailable from other sources" (p. 180), but it has generally been restricted to appraisals designed to foster teacher improvement, because objectivity is questionable, if promotion, tenure, or salary is tied to the evaluation.

Much work on teachers' self-reflection as the basis for their learning focuses on their use of reflective logs or journals. Certain oral dialogue situations also provide great potential for teachers' self-reflection and learning, particularly when teachers talk about teaching innovations in which they themselves have engaged (Emery, 1996). Emery (1996) concluded that conversations among teachers focusing on innovative practice constitute a promising alternative to the log or journal in eliciting reflective behavior. It is believed that sustained conversations yield more in the way of confronting teachers behavior and reconstructing action. Also, conversations among teachers will provide the potential to achieve the purpose of reflectivity. Open dialogues between teachers enable them to question taken-for-granted practices, to form hypotheses for alternative action, and to test these in the classroom (Emery, 1996).

If the overall quality of teaching is to be improved, teachers must be capable of becoming more aware of their subjective beliefs about teaching and its contexts. Teachers

must develop capacities for reflective action and move away from a perception of everyday reality as given, clearly defined, and in need of no further verification beyond its simple presence (O'Donoghue & Brooker, 1996). In contrast to routine action, namely action promoted by tradition, authority, official pronouncements, and circumstances, reflective action incorporates active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further consequences to which it leads (Dewey, 1993, p. 9; O'Donoghue & Brooker, 1996, p. 101). Reflectivity attempts to move teachers away from a notion of one best way of teaching toward a consideration of the appropriateness of various strategies (Cruickshank, 1985).

Schon (1987) pointed out that reflective teaching means careful planning and continual reflecting-in-practice and reflecting-on-practice about both the intellectual and ethical dimensions of classroom teaching and learning (Dollase, 1996, p. 92). Such teaching requires passion for the subject matter, high expectations for all students, and multicultural sensitivity to the diversity of students' needs and family backgrounds. Teachers must view students as active learners whose intellectual capacities, emotional and moral levels of development, and self-esteem and self-worth deserve respect and enhancement.

Saphier (1993) advised administrators to ask teachers to write a self-evaluation at some point in their cycle of professional growth. After the administrator has carefully read the self-evaluations, a conference should be scheduled with the teacher. These conferences are a wonderful opportunity to communicate interest and support for teachers' self-set

goals. The process itself communicates trust in the teachers' judgment to pick a worthwhile goal for their own development (Saphier, 1993, p. 49). In these conferences, the administrators should use active-listening skills and become a facilitator of the teachers' thinking. Saphier (1993) contends that as teachers write about what they are doing, their self-evaluations will actually stimulate and advance their thinking about what they are doing: "I write what I know to find out what I think" (Saphier, 1993, p. 49).

Teacher reflection is a necessary condition for teacher change, but in order to bring about reform in the teacher evaluation process or in teacher effectiveness, the change must come from the school as a whole (Hargreaves, 1997). Hence, regardless of how innovative and energetic individual teachers may be, they can easily burn out in a hostile school environment.

Portfolio Assessment

Shulman (1992) pointed out that a significant obstacle to improving instructional effectiveness is that teaching is like dry ice at room temperature--it evaporates in front of our eyes and leaves no visible traces. In most cases, there is little tangible evidence of the teaching that took place, and consequently, only a limited opportunity to examine its strengths and weaknesses. Learning from experience is often unrealized because evidence of teaching effectiveness is frequently unavailable.

Teaching portfolios address this problem by providing teachers with a structure for documenting and reflecting on their practice. By collecting an array of information about their teaching over time in authentic contexts, teachers can build a broad and textured

picture of their practice. Through this process teachers can gain insights into their instructional practices in ways that they would not have been able to otherwise (Bird, 1990; Wolf , 1994,1995). The portfolio concept, which can be operationalized in a number of ways, documents and informs learning and instruction in ways that other assessment methods cannot because portfolios provide a connection to the contexts and personal histories of real teaching (and learning) and make it possible to document the unfolding of both teaching and learning over time (Krause, 1996).

Teaching portfolios can capture the complexities of professional practice in ways that no other approach can (Wolf, 1996). Portfolios are reflective in nature. Portfolios promote self-analysis and critical reflection in ways that help unpack the complexities of teaching (Carroll, Potthoff, & Huber, 1996). Portfolios purport to be an alternative form of assessment. Portfolios require much more work than predictable tests; they take longer to prepare; they take longer to read; and they give evaluators more problems of interpretation and grading (Simmons, 1996). A teaching portfolio is a collection of information about a teachers' practice. It should carefully and thoughtfully document a set of accomplishments attained over an extended period of time. It is an ongoing process conducted in the company of mentors and colleagues.

Teachers create portfolios for a variety of reasons. Proponents of portfolios claim that portfolios provide teachers with an opportunity and a structure to document and describe their teaching; articulate their professional knowledge; and reflect on what, how, and why they teach (Borko, Michalec, Timmons, & Siddle, 1997). While the specific form and content of a portfolio can vary depending upon its purpose, most portfolios contain

some combination of teaching artifacts and written reflections (Wolf, 1996). The contents of a portfolio should reflect the purposes for doing the portfolio. What goes into a teacher constructed portfolio depends on why the portfolio is being created. Improvement of teaching effectiveness is the ultimate purpose for teacher constructed portfolios (Potthoff, Carroll, Anderson, Attivo, & Kear, 1996). Portfolio development should involve articulating an educational philosophy, identifying goals, building and refining the portfolio, and framing the contents for presentation to others. Most structured systems attempt to ensure coverage of competencies generally required of teachers: knowledge of subject matter, intellectual ability and problem solving, pedagogical skills, curriculum knowledge, knowledge of learning and learners, and attitudes and dispositions considered appropriate for teachers. Portfolios are well suited to this task if they are flexible, collected from a variety of sources, collected over time, and interpreted in holistic fashion (Simmons, 1996, p. 72). Portfolios are valid because of their variability. Portfolios include samples drawn from many activities in many settings over a longer period of duration than most one-course or one-test samples (Gellman, 1992-1993; Simmons, 1996). While selection may be the cornerstone for building a portfolio, reflection about the portfolio utilization helps educators see how learning can help students to be critical and self-determined thinkers (Emery, 1996).

Portfolios developed from whole questions instead of a list of requirements presume what has been learned and what evidence best demonstrates anyone's learning (Simmons, 1996). Asking whole questions, ones that can be applied to a variety of people and that can be answered in a variety of ways, preserves the opportunity for surprise and

integration. This allows teachers to show their thinking, not just the product of their thought and allows them to choose the vehicle for conveying the product (Simmons, 1996, p. 72).

Portfolios provide the tool needed for beginning teachers to assess their own development. Portfolios can provide a particularly useful learning tool for preservice teachers, helping them to recognize their past experience and ways of thinking and doing, their present skills, and their understandings of teaching and learning. Portfolio development also informs teachers as to what they still need to learn about themselves, their content and methods, and future or current students (Ford & Ohlhauseer, 1991; Nettles & Petrick, 1995; Wolf, 1991; Zidon, 1996; Zubizaretta, 1991). Portfolios allow beginning teachers as well as experienced teachers to examine their assumptions and beliefs about teaching. According to Simmons (1996) beginning (student) teachers must from the time they enter college, become historians of their own learning, and we must model such reflection for them, by telling our own stories and sharing our own portfolios. As productive as teaching portfolios might be for engendering individual reflection and improving practice, their value in promoting teaching effectiveness are more likely to dramatically increase when they serve as the focal point for conversations with colleagues about teaching (Wolf, 1995). Shulman (1992) offered the following definition of a teaching portfolio:

> A teaching portfolio is the structured documentary history of a set of coached mentored accomplishments, substantiated by samples of student

> work, and fully realized only through reflective writing, deliberation, and serious conversation. (p. 31)

Teaching portfolios achieve their full value when they become a departure point for substantive conversations about the quality of a teacher's work (Wolf, 1995). A more sustained, consistent practice of portfolio work throughout the teacher education program links to the idea of portfolio as a "workplace", with the emphasis on improvement and development (Bird, 1990; Zidon, 1996). Wolf (1995) concluded that by engaging teachers and teachers-in-development in the practice of documenting and reflecting on their teaching, and in holding regular and focused conversations with their colleagues about their practice, we are building individual dispositions and a professional culture that values reflective, collaborative practice. The hope is that teachers who prepare their own portfolios, and use these portfolios to talk with their peers about their performance, will become better at implementing these same practices with their own students.

Zidon (1996) found that portfolios informed preservice teachers about their professional and academic growth, helped them to see areas of strength and areas of concern, and helped them to think about and set future goals. Zidon's study demonstrated that acceptance and excitement for portfolios among preservice teachers is vested in sound educational practices: creating interest and giving a reason for portfolios, providing guidelines for construction, offering opportunities for discussion with peers and faculty, and teaching the practice of reflection, all of which should be recursive (Zidon, 1996, p. 69).

Mokhtari, Yellin, Bull, and Montgomery (1996) found that preservice teachers were very receptive to portfolios and portfolio assessment. The subjects demonstrated knowledge about portfolio assessment and showed willingness to use portfolios to evaluate their own progress despite initial concerns about the time and effort involved in using portfolios. Preservice teachers' willingness to evaluate their own progress could mean that they are critical of traditional assessment measures and will favor the use of portfolios in their own classrooms.

The authentic, ongoing, collaborative, and multidimensional nature of portfolios enables both students and teachers to reflect on student learning and growth throughout a program, an opportunity that does not occur as easily with the use of simulated, static, and solitary, and unidimensional assessment instruments (Mokhhtari, Yellin, Bull, & Montgomery, 1996, p. *251).* Portfolio assessment also helps preservice teachers become self-directed and reflective practitioners.

Dollase (1996) reported preliminary findings that indicated both cooperating teachers and former student teachers who are now teaching generally believe that the prospective teacher's portfolio is a valuable and a positive innovation. The cooperating teachers felt the portfolio was a good professional organizer. The student teachers also felt it was a good organizer as well as an excellent way to assist teacher reflection and growth.

Without careful exploration and feedback, portfolio assessment could become just another time-consuming exercise in ranking and labeling done in response to administrative mandates rather than learners' needs (Mokhtari, Yellln, Bull, & Montgomery, 1996). Portfolio assessment experts agree that the best way to increase the

understanding of portfolio assessment is to reemphasize its underlying purpose of providing a systematic and flexible way to gather information to be used for enhancing learning and teaching.

According to Wolf (1996), portfolios have much to offer the teaching profession. When teachers carefully examine their own practices, those practices are likely to improve. The examples of accomplished practice that portfolios provide also can be studied and adapted for use in other classrooms. Portfolios allow teachers to retain examples of good teaching so they can examine them, talk about them, adapt them, and adopt them. Portfolios cultivate outstanding teaching and learning.

Other Forms of Self Evaluation

The "2 + 2 for Teachers" (Allen, Nichols, & LeBlanc, 1997) is a teacher performance appraisal program that involves teachers and administrators in a series of regular peer observations. Each observation produces two compliments and two suggestions for improvement or change. The premise of 2 + 2 for Teachers is simple and straightforward: Maximizing professional interactions, decreasing teacher isolation, and increasing meaningful feedback will lead to improved instruction (Allen, Nichols, & LeBlanc, 1997). The key to 2 + 2 is peer observation. It is as important and beneficial for teachers to have the opportunity to see other teachers in action as it is to receive compliments and suggestions from their peers. The cumulative effect of the changes brought about by the 2 + 2, and the requirement to maintain a portfolio of compliments and suggestions that includes documentation and evaluation of suggestions acted upon is

expected to improve instruction. In the 2 + 2 process, observation skills are constantly improved, leading to heightened awareness of the entire educational setting; 2 + 2 is helping teachers to become more reflective about their own teaching and to see a role for themselves in offering encouragement and feedback to their peers (Allen, Nichols, & LeBlanc, 1997).

Career Development Reinforcing Excellence (CADRE) is a career development program that promotes accountability for and reflective inquiry about teaching and learning while challenging the long-held assumptions about and practices in supervision, evaluation, and professional development. CADRE centers around a collaborative accountability network characterized by: (a) collective goals (institutional, team, and individual) driven by the needs of learners and the school, (b) self- and team-directed appraisal, (c) collegial dialogues about teaching and learning, and (d) high mutually-determined performance expectations for both faculty and administration (Pace-Marshall & Hatcher, 1996). Teachers prepare plans for authentic inquiry about a specific dimension of teaching and learning. Through annual written self-assessments, teachers and their collegial support teams have opportunities to revise the initial inquiries. CADRE supports teachers' seeking counsel from colleagues about whether they have demonstrated increased understanding of teaching and learning, improved their instruction, and engaged in collaborative inquiry.

Peer coaching was first proposed as an on-site dimension of staff development. Today, peer coaching study teams enhance staff development efforts and offer support for teachers implementing new strategies (Showers & Joyce, 1996). The collaborative work

of peer coaching teams is much broader than observation and conferences. Teachers learn from one another while planning instruction, developing support materials, watching one another work with students, and thinking together about the impact of their behavior on their students' learning. According to Showers and Joyce (1996) the formation of peer coaching teams produces greater faculty cohesion and focus and, in turn, facilitates more skillful decision making. A skillful staff development program results in a self-perpetuating process for changes, new knowledge and skills for teachers, and increased learning for students.

Through storytelling, teachers are able to consider alternative ways to think about and to behave toward children different from themselves in race, social class, and language backgrounds. By sharing stories, teachers can engage in collaborative critique regarding classroom events, see the strengths of children who may be labeled by others as deficient, take greater control over their own development as teachers, and develop plans for future action that will support all children (Gomez, 1996). Stories make permeable the boundaries of our own and others' life experiences and enable the appraisal of these experiences (Gomez, 1996; Smith, 1991). Through telling and listening to stories, individuals are able to put the personal and particular into perspective and to fashion notions of truth and representation (Gomez, 1996). Gomez (1996) found that storytelling occasions among prospective teachers enhanced the teachers' understanding of themselves--the strengths as well as the limitations of what they bring as perspectives on others to teaching. Stories could serve as experience and could become the basis for the development of judgment and thinking within a profession (Pinnegar, 1996).

Directions for Future Research

Teacher self evaluations, reflective practitioners, long-term professional development projects, teaching portfolios, peer coaching, and storytelling all have common properties that aid in assessing teaching quality. All have provisions for teachers to have opportunities for self-reflection and collegial interactions based on documented episodes of their own teaching. All are components of the "new" teacher evaluation process that involves individual goal setting, self analysis, collaboration, and collegiality.

In spite of increased knowledge about effective teaching and about successful organizational improvement, the model used for assessing the job performance of classroom teachers has changed little in this century (Ostrander, 1996). Current practices do not reflect developments in the field nor do they support recent reform efforts (Ellet & Garland, 1987; Ostrander, 1996).

Atkins (1996) stated that the time has come for the school system to update the evaluation process. Teachers should become more involved in the process since the improvement of instruction is in the hands of the teachers.

Restructuring professional development to promote teacher leadership can bring about classroom change. Kaplan (1997) stated that processes for developing teachers' leadership within the school and within the classroom should employ adult learning processes similar to those desired for students. This will assure that all such processes are authentic, engaging, meaningful, and relevant. When new learning for educators is both

experimental and content based, sustained and facilitated over time in collegial work with a resultant product, change can occur for students in the classroom (Kaplan, 1997, p. 20).

The need for new approaches to teacher coaching and evaluating is great (Bryant, 1998, p. 3). Bryant (1998) found that schools in Cincinnati have discovered an effective strategy: the use of excellent classroom teachers as consulting teachers. Consulting teachers assist and evaluate teachers new to the district as well as veterans who have been referred to the program for performance problems by administrators.

Lead teaching is an emerging concept in which identified teachers accept responsibility for planning, delivering, and evaluating instructional programs and services (Kaplan, 1997, p. 16). When lead teachers and administrators form a cadre of visionary leadership, teachers become the implementors of change in the classroom.

Team evaluation, or 360-degree feedback, is so well established in American business and industry that it has become a recurring theme in Filbert cartoons (Manatt, 1997, p. 8). Team evaluation means that an employee is evaluated by all with whom the employee has contact: supervisors, peers, clients, and the public. Manatt (1977) noted that team evaluation, 360-degree feedback, is attractive to school districts because student achievement is not improving and because traditional evaluation lacks the ability to sort teachers' ratings.

Ostrander (1996) reported that effective teaching can not be defined by any one teaching skill; thus measures of many aspects of teaching must be taken into account to yield the fairest and most comprehensive evaluation of teachers. According to Ostrander (1996), there has been a call for the development of multiple and variable lines of evidence

about teacher performance in an effort to improve the state of teacher evaluation. This movement parallels the national trend toward increased client involvement in school governance and decision making.

Teacher reflectivity can be a viable part in the growth and development of novice teachers. Educational settings have great uncertainty, instability, complexity, and variety which means teacher educators must seek more effective and nurturing ways to prepare novices for such settings. Teacher reflectivity is one means to move teacher educators toward a more refined description and understanding of how individuals transform from novices to experts (Pultorak, 1996).

The first source of informative feedback available to instructors is themselves (Paulsen & Feldman, 1995). The information many instructors receive about their teaching comes from their own observations of their teachings coupled with their reflections on those observations. According to Paulsen and Feldman (1995) one way to create a continuous source of informative feedback is to supplement the traditional adage, "Think before you act," with the conventional, "Act and reflect on your actions."

REFERENCES

Allen, D. W., Nichols, R. D., Jr., & LeBlanc, A. C. (1997). The prime teacher appraisal program: 2+2 for teachers. The High School Magazine, 4 (4), 30-35.

Atkins, A. O. (1996). Teachers' opinions of the teacher evaluation process. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 398 628)

Barell, J. (1991). Reflective teaching for thoughtfulness. In A. L. Costa (Ed.), Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking (rev. ed.) (pp. 207-210). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bird, T. (1990). The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay on possibilities. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), The new handbook of teacher education (pp. 241-256). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Borko, H., Michalec, P., Timmons, M., & Siddle, J. (1997). Student teaching portfolios: A tool for promoting reflective practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 48 (5), 345-357.

Brandt, R. (1996). On a new direction for teacher evaluation: A conservation with Tom McGreal. Educational Leadership, 53 (6), 30-33.

Bryant, F. (1998). Should principals coach as well as evaluate? American Teacher, 82 (6), 4.

Carroll, J. G. (1981). Faculty self-evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 180-200). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Carroll, J., Potthoff, D., & Huber, T. (1996). Learnings from three years of portfolio use in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (4), 253-261.

Colton, B., & Spark-Langer, G. (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision making. Journal of Teacher Education, 44 (1), 45-54.

Costa, A. (1995). New psychology of supervision. In G. Slick (Ed.), Emerging trends in teacher preparation: The future of field experiences (pp. 10-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Cruickshank, D. R. (1985). Uses and benefits of reflective teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (10), 704-706.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Boston: D. C. Heath.

Dollase, R. H. (1996). Portfolios and reflection in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (2), 85-98.

Ellett, C., & Garland, J. (1987). Teacher evaluation practices in our largest school districts: Are they measuring up to "state-of-the-art" systems. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1, 69-92.

Emery, W. G. (1996). Teachers' critical reflection through expert talk. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (2), 110-118.

Ford, M. P., & Ohlhausen, M. (1991). Portfolio assessment in teacher education courses: Impact on students' beliefs, attitudes, and habits. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 088)

Francis, D. (1995). The reflective journal: A window to preservice teachers' practical knowledge. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11 (3), 229-242.

Gellman, E. (1992-93). The use of portfolios in assessing teacher competence: Measurement issues. Action in Teacher Education, 14, 39-44.

Gomez, M. L. (1996). Looking in classrooms (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). Rethinking educational change: Going deeper and wider in the quest for success. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), Rethinking educational change with heart (pp. 1-26). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kaplan, L. S. (1997). Professional development for restructuring: Teacher leadership for classroom change. The High School Magazine, 4 (4), 14-21.

Krause, S. (1996). Portfolios in teacher education: Effects of instruction on preservice teacher's early comprehension of the portfolio process. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (2), 130-138.

Lampert, M., & Clark, C. (1990). Expert knowledge and expert thinking in teaching: A response to Floden and Klinzing. Educational Researcher, 19 (5), 21-23.

Manatt, R. P. (1997). Feedback from 360 degrees. The School Administrator, 54 (3), 8-13.

Mokhtari, K., Yellin, D., Bull, K., & Montgomery, D. (1996). Portfolio assessment in teacher education: Impact on preservice teachers' knowledge and attitudes. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (4), 245-252.

Nettles, D. H., & Petrick, P. B. (1995). Portfolio development for preservice teachers. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

O'Donoghue, T. A., & Brooker, R. (1996). The rhetoric and the reality of the promotion of reflection during practice teaching: an Australian case study. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (2), 99-109.

Ostrander, L. R. (1996). Multiple judges of teacher effectiveness: Comparing teacher self-assessment with the preceptions of principals, students, and parents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 399 267)

Pace, Marshall, S., & Hatcher, C. (1996). Promoting career development through CADRE. Educational Leadership, 53 (6), 42-46.

Paulsen, M. B., & Feldman, K. A. (1995). Taking teaching seriously: Meeting the challenge of instructional improvement. Washington, D. C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED). (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 396 616)

Pinegar, S. (1996). Sharing stories: A teacher educator accounts for narrative in her teaching. Action in Teacher Education, 18 (3), 13-22.

Potthoff, D., Carroll, J., Anderson, P., Attivo, B., & Kear, D. (1996). Striving for integration: A portfolio content analysis. Action in Teacher Education, 18 (1), 48-58.

Pultorak, E. G., (1996). Following the development process of reflection in novice teachers: Three years of investigation. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (4), 283-291.

Richert, A. E. (1990). Teachig teachers to reflect: A consideration of programme structure. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22, 509-527.

Ross, D. D. (1990). Programmatic structures for the preparation of reflective teachers. In R. T. Cliff, W. R. Houston, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in education (pp. 97-118). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sagor, R. (1997). Collaborative action research for educational change. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), Rethinking educational change with heart and mind (pp. 169-191). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Saphier, J. (1993). How to make supervision and evaluation really work. Carlisle, Massachusetts: Research for Better Teaching.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 53 (6), 12-16.

Shulman, L. S. (1992). Portfolios for teacher education: A component of reflective teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Simmons, J. (1996). Control the purpose, not the contents: Coaching the creation of teaching portfolios. Action in Teacher Education, 18 (1), 71-81.

Smith, D. (1991). Hermeneutic inquiry: The hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. In E. G. Short (Ed.), Forms of curriculum inquiry (pp. 187-209). Albany: SUNY Press.

Stiggens, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth system-different purposes. NASSP Bulletin, 70, 51-58.

Wear, S. B., & Harris, J. C. (1994). Becoming a reflective teacher: The role of stimulated recall. Action in Teacher Education, 16 (2), 445-51.

Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L. S., & Richert, A. E. (1987). 150 different ways of knowing: Representation of knowledge in teaching. In J. Caldahead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking (pp. 104-124). London: Cassell.

Wolf, K. (1996). Developing an effective teaching portfolio. Educational Leadership, 53 (6), 34-37.

Wolf, K. (1995). Teaching portfolios conversations for teacher educators and teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 17 (1), 30-39.

Wolf, K. (1994). Teaching portfolios: Capturing the complexity of teaching. In L. Ingvarson & R. Chadborne (Eds.), Valuing teachers' work: New directions in teacher appraisal (pp. 112-136). Victoria, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Wolf, K. (1991). The schoolteachers' portfolio: Issues in design, implementation, and evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 129-136.

Zidon, M. (1996). Portfolios in preservice teacher education; What the students say. Action in Teacher Education, 18 (1), 59-70.

Zubizarreta, J. (1994). Teaching portfolios and the beginning teacher. Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (4), 323-326.